

**REMARKS**

In the Official Action of July 15, 2005, the Examiner required an election under 35 U.S.C. § 121 among four allegedly distinct inventions, namely:

Invention I, referring to claim 1, drawn to a guide system for generating guide contents from site information;

Invention II, referring to claims 2-4 and 8-13, drawn to a server and process of generating guide contents from site information;

Invention III, referring to claims 5-7 and 14-19, drawn to a portable device and process utilizing information on information sources; and

Invention IV, referring to claims 20-25, drawn to a computer-readable medium with an information processing program.

The Examiner has contended that Invention IV and Inventions II/III are related as process of making and product made, but are distinct from one another since the process as claimed can be used to make other materially different products, such as printed instructions.

The Examiner has also contended that Invention I and Inventions II/III/IV are related as combination and subcombinations, but are distinct since the combination of Invention I does not require the particulars of the claimed subcombinations since the details of the subcombinations are not set forth in the combination, and since the subcombinations have separate utilities such as a backup system for a mainframe computer.

Finally, the Examiner has contended that Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination, but are distinct from one another since Invention II has a separate utility, such as a backup system for a mainframe computer.

The Examiner further required an election under 35 U.S.C. § 121 among five allegedly distinct species of the claimed invention, namely:

Species A, referring to the embodiment of Figures 1-19;

Species B, referring to the embodiment of Figure 20;

Species C, referring to the embodiment of Figures 22-23;

Species D, referring to the embodiment of Figures 24-26; and

Species E, referring to the embodiment of Figures 27A/B-28.

The Examiner has asserted that these species are patentably distinct.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicant hereby elects to prosecute Invention II covering claims 2-4 and 8-13. Applicant further elects to prosecute Species A as shown in Figs. 1-19. Applicant submits that each of elected claims 2-4 and 8-13 read on the embodiment of Figures 1-19.

In view of the foregoing elections, claims 1, 5-7 and 14-25 stand withdrawn from further consideration in the present application without prejudice to applicant's right to file one or more divisional applications directed thereto.

Application No.: 10/632,871

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-319

If there are any additional charges in connection with this response, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert B. Cohen

Registration No.: 32,768

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

LD-447\

585886\_1.DOC